

# THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

79392

---

*"The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth."*

---

VOL. 4.

New York, May, 1849.

NO. 1.

---

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

---

DEAN, PRINTER, 2 ANN-ST.

This JOURNAL will be issued on the first of each month at One Dollar a year, in advance. City subscribers will be regularly served at their residences by sending their names to 762 Broadway.

Subscribers may remit to the Editor, by mail, the amount of their subscription.

Subscribers can have the Journal sent to them by mail, on the above terms.

All communications must be addressed, (post paid) to the Editor, 762 Broadway.

---

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

---

NEW YORK, MAY, 1849.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

We now commence the labor of another year, in the publication of this Journal. We do not deem it necessary to say much by way of introduction to this volume. We are not of those who deal in promises, for we shall, as heretofore, let each number speak for itself. We hope our friends will not bestow upon us quite so much of wordy praise, but in place thereof, according to their professed favorable opinion of our labors, exert themselves to extend the circulation of our periodical. If the doctrines we advocate, are true, the sooner they are known and appreciated, the better. Therefore, the friends of homœopathy are in duty bound to use means to spread the knowledge of that system of medicine.

We have had a few complaints, and for these we are thankful. One desires our sheet to appear weekly—give us 3000 paying subscribers, and it shall be done. Another wishes

it to appear twice in a month—let us have 2000 paying subscribers, and we will do it. Another wants it enlarged to a hundred or more pages with a beautiful cover, &c., &c., and increase the price to \$3—this we will not do under any circumstances. We want the American Journal of Homœopathy read, and although each number, contains but sixteen pages, we have lost three subscribers for this volume, each of whom wrote us, that he was "highly pleased with the Journal" but had not time to read it. One writes us to make the next volume "more practical:" this is a puzzler; for the life of us, we do not understand what it means. If an allopath should give us such advice, we would understand him at once; but when a homœopath thus advises, we are at fault. Are not the volumes already published full of principles, clearly defined, and fully illustrated, which are sure guides in the healing art? These are what a homœopath wants, he cannot move without them; but an allopath only wants the name of a disease, and a case related as a model of the treatment of it, and that is practical matter for him; for with principles he does not deal—a law of cure he has no conception of. The relation of cases, as models of treatment for a homœopath is useless—it is quackery in homœopathy.

We set little value on reported cases, for if they are used as models, their effect is pernicious. If a group or groups of symptoms clearly expressed, have been removed by a particular drug, in a particular attenuation, such facts are useful. These help to improve our *materia medica*.

Let it be understood, that the practice of homœopathy requires the judgment of the physician, in the application of its principles to each case treated. No one needs expect to be a safe and successful practitioner of our

art, who is not a close student. He who is indolent cannot be a true physician of our school.

We respectfully solicit communications, adapted to the character of this Journal. We at all times endeavor to express our own thoughts, in as few words as possible, and we hope our correspondents will oblige us, or rather our readers, in that way. Long articles are seldom read.

We do hope, that physicians of our school throughout this country, will see their interest promoted by aiding us in our work. If we were to consult our own ease, if we were controlled by mere selfishness, we would not issue another number of this Journal. It is not the most pleasant thing, to be compelled, after the labors of the day, to set up whole nights to prepare matter for the printer, and after all our care, to find, when it is too late to correct, some blunder in our articles, obscuring the sense, or destroying it altogether: and then in a few days afterwards, to receive some allopathic journal, who points out, not in the most polite manner, what we ourselves have already discovered, and instead of charitably attributing it to an oversight or an error, places it boldly to our "ignorance," and hurls it at the whole school. And the only consolation we can obtain is to pay them in their own coin, which fortunately for us, is usually quite plenty.

On the whole we have got along, much better than we expected. The American Journal of Homœopathy is established; its character is now understood, and many have stated that their first knowledge of homœopathy was obtained from its pages. We shall try to do better, but of this we will not speak.

#### HOMŒOPATHIA: WHY IT IS OPPOSED.

To spread error, requires very little sacrifice of labor or expense; but to spread truth demands much of both. What is necessary to be known for the happiness of man, is plain, near at hand, and may be reached by all. The human mind influenced by pride, overlooks truth, for pride feeds on error, which is its natural food. Whoever has an unreasonable conceit of his own superiority in talents, can never perceive much of truth on any subject. In proportion as truth lives in the mind, so is the diminution of pride, for he who has the largest supply of truth, is the

most humble. This principle applies to all branches of human knowledge. Medical history shows no class of men, so intolerant as physicians, in matters relating to medicine. This tendency to refuse to tolerate others in the enjoyment of their opinions has been strengthening for years, until it is now developed to a degree beyond any former period. This condition is in consequence of the baseless theories, the thousands of pretended facts, which are but so many lies, and the illogical reasonings founded upon them, which fill thousands of volumes on medicine. Such masses of error when thrown into the minds of students cannot but engender pride, which may forever prevent them from admitting true principles, especially if these tend to disturb their previously formed notions.

The period is approaching when this state of things in the medical profession must mend or end. The time for persecution for opinion's sake has passed, and no well-informed man will allow himself in such folly.

He who habitually suspects or charges others with dishonesty, is liable to have his own integrity suspected also. The continued personal attacks upon those who have seen fit to adopt homœopathy; leads to a suspicion that their assailants, are not quite as honorable minded and pure hearted as they would have the world believe. We could introduce published charges bearing directly upon this point, but it is not necessary, our readers hear more, perhaps, on that subject, than we do. There happens to lay upon our table while we write, a notice of a pamphlet by Henry Muller, M. D., Professor, &c., in the medical school of Louisville, Ky., in which an attempt is made to examine the claims of homœopathy as a system, &c. He says "Homœopathic doses of medicine are nothing, absolutely nothing, and in themselves, incapable of doing either good or harm." How he obtained this knowledge is a question which he does not solve; and, as he never tried them, we are left to suppose that he is in the same predicament with the wise farmer, who hooted at the idea of the earth's turning over:—"That can't be, because it's impossible."

Quite a different view is taken of the same subject by Dr. Millengen, Surgeon to the British forces, a man of great experience and practical knowledge, and honored by many titles. He wrote a book, entitled "Curiosities of Medical Experience." In this work

he ridicules some of the *theories* of Hahnemann, but admits the value of the law of cure, and the efficacy of the remedies, and gives cases cured by them. "I trust" says Dr. Millengen, "that the few cases I have related will afford convincing proof of the injustice, if not the unjustifiable obstinacy of those practitioners, who, refusing to submit the homœopathic practice to a fair trial, condemn it without investigation. The introduction of infinitely small doses, when compared, at least, with the quantities formerly prescribed, is gradually creeping in. The history of medicine affords abundant proof of the acrimony, nay, the fury, with which every new doctrine has been impugned and insulted. The same annals will also show that this spirit of intolerance has always been in the ratio of the truths that these doctrines tended to bring into light. From the preceding observations, no one can accuse me of having become a blind bigot of homœopathy; but I can only hope that its present vituperators will follow my example, and examine the matter calmly and dispassionately, before they proceed to pass a judgment, that their vanity may lead them to consider a final sentence."

For the American Journal of Homœopathy.

### GLONOINE,

#### *A New Medicine for Headache, &c.*

I invite my colleagues to take part in proving of this very important substance, which may in a very short time be of daily use and will assist us in curing a great many important cases; for instance, some forms of apoplexy with more precision than hitherto.

Glonoine is made of the Glycerine or Oil Sweet of Scheele, a substance which remains after saponification of nearly all animal or vegetable oils and fats, and is considered a component part of the same. In our case the Glycerine has been prepared from the genuine Olive Oil. Glycerine or Glycyloxyhydrate is modified by nitro-sulphuric acid, undergoing the same process which cotton undergoes when changed into gun-cotton. It is equally explosive.

As Sobrero, the discoverer of this substance, did not give it a name, I called it Glonoine, from Glo, oxyd of Glycyl, No, Nitric Acid, and the termination, ine. Sobrero remarked, it had a pungent taste and

caused violent headache with every one who tasted it.

With this remark, the new substance becomes an important one to physiologists, as there is nothing known which in such small quantities and with such precision causes headache. Every substance with such certainty of effect, ought also to be considered as important to the physician. No matter according to what rule he may give his drugs, he must allow the importance of this agency, and may now test his theory by pointing out the cases in which it not only may help the patients, but *must* help, and in which the cure has to follow with the certainty of a mathematical conclusion.

But alas! poor boasting physicians of the old allopathic schools! What can they do? Here is the discovery, here is a powerful substance, what is to be done with it? They do not know and never will know, except they steal cowardly the results of our investigations, and bring it out as their own with the same impudence as they have done already, viz: Aconite in inflammations, Arnica in bruises, Nux vomica as a cathartic, &c., &c. They imagine they have "rationalized" the results of our practice either by mixing those drugs with something else, or by "appendixing" a nonsensical series of words called a theoretical explanation. Nobody knows, nor do they know themselves, what will be said to make the Glonoine rational; but after we have done, and they have stolen it, it will be no doubt "rationalized."

Our Glonoine has even created a great sensation among members of the "regular profession." This spring, a graduate of one of the Philadelphia colleges made it the subject of his thesis. He asked me for information, and I gave him all I knew of its history, preparation and properties. He of course does not say that experiments had been made with it by homœopaths more than a year ago, nor does he mention the name given it by me. After being shown the somewhat difficult mode of preparing it, he at last succeeded in obtaining a small quantity, with which he made some valuable experiments on a cat, and on several healthy persons. I understand the Professors of the College are so much pleased with this thesis, that they intend to have it published. A Professor of the same College,—by the way a great physiologist,—had such an idea of this awful substance, that he not only would not taste it, but would not

even allow a bottle of it to be opened in his presence! Quite natural; for *Ars. longa, vita brevis est.*

The contrast is immense if we come to the homœopathic side of the parties. All homœopathic physicians, how much they may differ otherways, every one, who has acknowledged the main truth of our school, immediately comes to the same conclusion.

This new substance has caused headache with all who tasted it: thus—1st. It has to be proved by a regular series of experiments on different healthy persons, in order to find out what kind of headache it produces. Not if this headache be called rheumatic, congestive or nervous, but exactly what kind of feelings are produced, where most, under what influences (of heat, weather, time of the day, motion of the head and body, position, &c.) it is aggravated or ameliorated, what symptoms besides headache are produced; it cannot cause headache without having a decided influence on the whole organism. 2nd. It will cure such headaches and other complaints in the sick as are similar to the symptoms produced by it on the healthy.

No mathematician, no mechanic, no chemist can be more certain with regard to his conclusions than we are. During the last eighteen months, a series of experiments on the healthy has been made with the Glonoine, and about twenty homœopathic physicians have already added their efforts to this great and important exploration. A number of other friends of our cause, have willingly suffered a little headache for a few minutes, in order to augment the observations, and increase by this the weight of probability with regard to the one or to the other characteristic. Even a number of very sceptical persons allowed a few pellets (each with the 5000th part of one drop) to melt on their tongues or take what little remained on the point of a pin. In all cases in which the dose was not too weak for the constitution, it always has within a few minutes caused headache and an alteration of the pulse.

The first experiments developing the kind of headache, being in the highest degree a throbbing one, lead me to the examination of the pulse, and in all cases the pulse was altered.

It is thus of the highest importance to observe most accurately the pulse before and during the experiment, and continue this even after it has returned to the former state. Very

often, a second new series of symptoms follows. The effects are sometimes like a wave going first up, and after some time down.—This has often been overlooked, and is thus not sufficiently proved.

One of the first observers (Dr. Jeanes) discovered the influence of the motions of the head on the pain, and one of the last provers (Dr. Rhees) the influence of the position of the body on the frequency of the pulse. Every prover has to regard all this hereafter.

The experiments commencing in winter, and being continued during summer, have shown the importance of the temperature, and since (Dr. Williamson) we had to add the state of the thermometer, and we must wish a repetition of the experiments by the same provers at different seasons.

The first observer, the chemist, Mr. Morris Davis, who prepared the Glonoine first in this country, has made interesting remarks about the influence on the perceptive faculties and it is to be hoped, that among the further provings this may be corroborated. His experiment on a cat, and mine on a frog, perfectly independent of each other, agree with regard to the kind of convulsions produced.

It was not without great difficulty, that a sufficient quantity of Glonoine was obtained. The successful operator, Doctor Zumbrock, had to suffer a nearly constant headache for weeks, augmenting at the same time the symptoms, while inventing the easiest and most certain method of preparation.

Let us now unite all our efforts; I can give every one who is willing to prove it a sufficient quantity. One drop is enough to make a long series of experiments. Animals require more. A frog did not die until he was forced to swallow 10 drops; a cat showed decided symptoms after swallowing 4 drops, and was well next day; another cat was killed by 3 drops. The strongest dose we have given to man was 1-10 drop. The provers took sugar globules moistened with Glonoine, each pellet containing on its surface about 1-5000 of a drop, thus 5 globules 1-1000, 50=1-100, 500=1-10. The provers have generally taken from 10 to 20 up to 40, 50, or 200 globules for a dose, only a few 1-10 drop.

Repetitions as soon as the effect seems to pass over, which is the case from 20 minutes to one hour—have produced more remarkable symptoms, but it is a purer observation to take a sufficiently strong dose at once, and observe



as long as possible every change even to the next day.

As antidote, I proposed according to theory, the common coffee as a drink, which has relieved very much in several cases. Dr. Zumbrock tried camphor with success for the first more violent symptoms. Dr. Gardiner removed his sick headache by *Nux vom.* It would be important to know the effect *Aconite* may have on the symptoms, and if not relieving, how it modifies the same.

To such of our colleagues as may be willing to prove or find others who will do it, I allow myself to recapitulate the following points.

1. Mention the day and temperature.
2. The time of the day it is taken, and during the first hour of the proving every symptom by the minute. The pulse to be observed, if not continually, every minute or two.
3. The exact direction of each pain or other feelings, the locality exact.
4. Influence of motions, especially of the head on the headache, of position, &c., on the pulse.
5. Influence of heat or cold; for instance cold water on the headache, or the pulse; the heat of the above on the headache, &c.
6. What influence has breathing on the headache or pulse; is a difference during inhalation and exhalation, holding breath with the lungs full of air or empty.
7. If there is any alteration on the perceptive faculties, &c.

As *Glonoine* is very volatile, care should be taken to have the bottles always well closed.

*Glonoine* may be had at Rademacher's, Philadelphia, William Radde, and J. S. T. Smith in New York.

CONSTANTINE HERING.

For the American Journal of Homœopathy.

Cleveland, O., March 9th, 1849

TO PROF. JARED P. KIRTLAND:

Dear Sir: To be found differing from high medical authority implies an unenviable position, and nothing except a strong sense of duty can or ought to be pled as an apology for so doing. Situated as you are in a Medical School, a teacher, you are presumed to be intimately acquainted with Medical Science, sifted and purified from all its intrinsic ac-

companiments, and your opinions are naturally enough looked upon and received as correct, and worthy of being relied upon. This fact alone justifies all who choose, to submit their views of your published opinions, as publically as they have been proclaimed, and to examine them fairly and impartially. Medical Science is not written in a sealed book, but is open for the investigation of all, and honest differences of opinion may well be tolerated, until the time shall arrive when all men, respecting it, shall think and act alike. We may therefore be excused if we refer to what we think objectionable or untrue in your late introductory lecture delivered before the class at the Western Reserve Medical College, and if you do not "coincide" with us, you will we trust, at least, concede to us honesty of purpose. In justice to yourself we will say, that with the exception of your plain and unmistakeable denunciations against homœopathy, and your misconceptions of the discovery claimed in your lecture, there is but little found that is objectionable. Your supposed discovery of this new doctrine of the coinciding tendencies of medicine, has led you into error relative to its real discoverer, and no doubt strongly inclined you to the belief that it is a doctrine peculiar to your school. But Sir, this is untrue. It is essentially a homœopathic doctrine, and we take this opportunity to thank you, not only for admitting it true, but for the effort made to sustain it before the public, regretting only, that your views of it were not more clear and practical, and that you did not "give honor to whom honor is due." All this however, we can readily overlook in view of the aid you have given us, and the consideration that your mind might have been unduly biased by hoisting upon it suddenly the flood gates of light. This is no uncommon occurrence in the night of mist with which your school is confessedly enveloped. The gem that illumines not unfrequently obscures the vision and at the moment throws darkness upon every thing around it. The experience of every well read physician teaches him the value of a truth in medicine, and leads him to regard it as a prize above all price, and should he dress it up in a fantastic garb for the sake of improving its first appearance, he should not be regarded as *ostentatious*, but applauded for his appreciation of it. You will not understand me as affirming that there are

no facts in your school, there are many. But do you and the school to which you belong, teach how to use them? You complain of Homœopathy, Hydropathy, Thompsonianism, and indeed of every mode of treating diseases, not excepting even the legion presented in Allopathy, down to domestic and patent remedies, or placebos, as you are pleased to call them. What then is the inference? Is it not, that all these modes of cure, not predicated on the doctrine of the coinciding tendencies of medicines, are wrong, and that the doctrine thus taught is only right? If so (and who can otherwise decide) this doctrine must supplant all others, and we think you are bound under your professions of love for it, and confidence in it, to teach all the facts necessarily connected with it. Let us now see how you get along with it, and how much you appreciate its importance in a practical point of view. You first aver that "remedies will coincide if not adapted to the fulfilment of the indications." By the word coincide, you say you mean "acts with the disease, aggravates the disease or produces fictitious disease." In your attempt to enforce this proposition, we understand you to say, that acute diseases are either "athenic" or "asthenic" not in the sense of the old writers, but in view of the essential symptoms, and requires appropriate and peculiar application of the means for cure. From this, three things should be made to appear to maintain the position, and render it practically useful.

First, the power of drugs should be known.

Second, the law of application should be known.

Third, the quantity of medicine necessary to cure, should likewise be known, as in opposition to their coinciding tendencies, or disease creating effects.

Now sir, do you, or your colleagues teach the class that the power of drugs must act in the peculiar manner required by the doctrine to fulfil the indications? or in other words, specifically and within disease creating limits? Certainly not in the lecture, and equally certain not in the books of your school. All that we can glean from the lecture on this point is summed up in the caution to watch the effect of drugs after they have been taken into the stomach, and if they or it "coincide" stop giving them. You neglect, however, to inform your class how the consequences of this coinciding tendency thus set up, may be

arrested, or how to avoid a similar disaster from the next remedy that is substituted for it. The examples you cite are too general to become either safe or useful. How are you to know, and how are your class to know, when the means are appropriate, and "fulfil the indications," only in so far as the results of an empirical trial of them show? Suppose you do know that Capsicum and Quinine stimulate in asthenic diseases, or that Neural Salts, Antimonials and the Lancet set up a contrary action, or an analogous general action in athenic diseases, it does not enable you to adapt your remedies in either case to the "fulfilment of the indications," under your definition of the two conditions. On the contrary, there must be a specific application in pursuance of the doctrine, or the words athenic and asthenic must have the full force originally given them, and of course merge the idea of specificity into the general idea of depleting and giving tone, so that after all, your students are only nominally in possession of the law, without knowing how to conform their practice to it. To remedy this evil, you and your school should teach the power of drugs, the law of application, and the means by which to determine the quantity to cure and not coincide. Allow us to ask you again, if you or your school impart this kind of information to your class? If so, you surpass, as above stated, in almost every particular the teachings of those who write your *Materia Medica*. The first thing taught in those books, direct remedies, in the treatment of athenic diseases, with a view to the reduction of the forces of life, and the opposite in the class of asthenic diseases. Before closing this letter, permit us to say, examine a little in detail the facts in reference to the discoverer and enunciator of this doctrine of coinciding tendencies of medicines. You say on page 5th of your lecture, that "attention seems however to have been directed exclusively to their curative powers, (referring to medicines) while their coinciding tendencies have been overlooked."

These tendencies have never been observed by any sect of irregular practitioners, nor by community at large, and too frequently have been disregarded by members of the regular profession. On page 8th of your lecture, you denominate homœopathy an absurdity; clearly meaning, that it is classed in your mind as belonging to irregular practice. Now Sir, your statements above made, are

true, or they are untrue; if true, the honor and glory of the discovery belong to you and yours; if untrue, then you stand before the world, the author of a mis-statement, thereby claiming to yourself and school, honors not exclusively your own. That you have made a mis-statement I will now proceed to show. On the 156th and 157th pages of Hahnemann's *Organon* you will find the following enunciation of the doctrine of the coinciding tendencies of medicine. "But although it is certain that a homœopathic remedy administered in a small dose, quietly annihilates the disease which is analogous to it, without producing its other non-homœopathic symptoms, that is to say, without exciting other and grievous sufferings, it often happens, notwithstanding that it produces at the expiration of one or a few hours after ingestion, (according to the dose) a state something less favorable, which resembles the primitive affection so closely, that the patient supposes the original disease is aggravated. But in reality, it is nothing more than a medicinal disease extremely similar to the primitive one, and rather more intense in its nature." Again, in a note on the same pages, he says: This preponderance of the symptoms of the remedy over the analogous symptoms of the disease, which looks like an increase of the natural malady, has also been observed by other physicians when chance led them to a homœopathic medicine. When the patient afflicted with itch, after having taken Sulphur, complains that the cutaneous eruption grows worse, the physician who is ignorant of the cause, consoles him by saying, that the itch comes out entirely before it can be cured; but he is not aware that it is an exanthema caused by the Sulphur, which assumes an appearance of aggravated itch. Leroy informs us that the *Viola Tricolor* commenced its action by rendering the cutaneous eruption of the face worse, of which it subsequently affected a cure. But he did not know that the apparent increase of the evil was caused solely by the administration of too large a dose of the remedy, which in this instance turned out to be homœopathic, or in other words, applied in pursuance of the law of their coinciding tendencies. Lysons, (See *Med. Trans.*, Vol. 11, London) says that skin diseases which yield with the greatest certainty to Elm Bark, are those which it increases in the first instance. If he had not according to the prevailing custom of the Allopathic school, administered

the bark of the elm in two large doses, but if, as its homœopathic character requires, it had been given in extremely small doses, the exanthema against which he prescribed it would have been cured without experiencing this increase of intensity, or at least it would have been subject to very slight development."

Were it not for extending this letter, numerous other instances might, and would be quoted in proof that this doctrine is not new to the homœopathic school, but is one of the cardinal features in it, and that it is the doctrine which Hahnemann proclaimed, first, after his discovery of the power of drugs, which eventually led to the use of small doses, which you and your school so much affect to despise. The chief difference between your enunciation of this doctrine, and Hahnemann's, consists in the exceedingly imperfect manner in which you have done it, and the clear and concise manner in which he has laid it before the world. You seem to have had but a glimpse of it, while his mighty intellect grasped all its practical bearings, and assigned to it its legitimate and scientific position in the profession. Here allow me to ask you what possible practical advantage can this law, (for such it is) afford the student or practitioner, if left where you leave it? To my mind it is evident, that if the whole range of drug power is not carefully adapted to the law in quality as well as quantity, and applied within conservative limits, the law itself can avail nothing. The use of the law presupposes the existence of this kind of knowledge, otherwise the practitioner cannot know when the disease he is treating, becomes worse, that it is not the natural morbid influence at work, instead of the medicine he has administered. Therefore, you will perceive that the physician, must know how to distinguish between the disease, creating causes, and the action of the drug he administers, otherwise he cannot know which is doing the mischief, and consequently cannot know how to apply the conservative influence of his law, or indeed, whether he may use it all.

Yours respectfully,

C. D. WILLIAMS.

Volumes 1, 2, and 3, of this Journal, at \$1 each, may be obtained at 762 Broadway. We have no Agents. The amount of subscription may be sent to the Editor, 762 Broadway.

*Annual Medical Report to the Board of Trustees of the N. York Homœopathic  
Dispensary Association.*

Names of Diseases.	Number of patients.	Left improved.	Left without amendment.	Under Treatment.	Discharged incurable.	Result unknown.	Cured.
Abuse of mercury,	1					1	
Amaurosis,	1					1	
Amenorrhœa,	11	2		1		4	4
Anasarca,	1					1	
Angina,	2			1			1
Aphonia,	1						1
Ascarides,	1						1
Ascites,	2			1			1
Asthma,	3			1		1	1
Bronchitis, acute and chronic,	21	3	1	1		9	7
Carditis,	2			2			
Caries,	2		1	1			
Capsular cataract, and strabismus,	1				1		
Caries of lower jaw, by mercury,	1						1
Catarrh, acute and chronic,	6						6
Catarrhal fever,	1						1
Cephalalgia,	11	1	2			1	7
Cholera infantum,	5	1				1	3
Chorea,	1					1	
Conjunctivitis,	1						1
Constipation,	1						1
Contusio,	2					1	2
Convulsions,	1						
Cough,	1						1
Cystitis,	1			1			
Delirium tremens,	1						1
Diabetes,	1					1	
Diarrhœa, acute and chronic,	16	3				4	9
Dysecoia,	1						
Dysmenorrhœa,	4			1		2	1
Dyspepsia,	40	11		1		4	23
Dysentery,	5	1		2		1	3
Ecthyma,	1	1					
Emissions, nocturnal,	1						
Enteritis, acute,	1			1			1
Epilepsy,	2						1
Epistaxis,	1			2		3	1
Eruptions,	4						1
Exostosis,	1					1	
Febris, gastrica,	1						5
— intermittent,	5						2
— typhoid,	2						2
— versatilis,	2						1
Fistula in ano,	1						1
Fracture of ulna,	1						2
Fractured femur,	2						1
Gastralgia,	1					1	3
Gastritis,	4						1
Gleet,	1						
Gleet, and varicocele,	1			1			1
Gonorrhœa,	3			2			
Gutta rosea,	1	1				1	1
Hæmoptysis,	3	1					2
Hæmorrhoids,	3			1			1
Hepatitis,	1						2
— chronic,	4	1				1	
Herpes,	1					1	1
Hypertrophy of tonsils,	1						1
Hysteria,	1						
Inflammation of fascia,	2			1		1	



Names of Diseases.	Number of patients.	Left improved.	Left without a result.	Under Treatment.	Discharged incurable.	Result unknown.	Cured.
Influenza,	3	1					2
Injuria,	1						1
Injuria of chest,	1						1
Laceration of lower lip,	1						1
Laryngitis,	1						
Leucorrhœa,	3	1				1	1
Lumbago,	2					1	1
Macule hepaticæ,	1					1	
Menorrhagia,	2	1				1	1
Mercurial erethismus,	1						
Mercurial tonsillitis,	1					1	
Menopsia,	2	1		1			
Monomania,	1			1			
Morbus coxarius,	1					1	
Neuralgia,	8	3		1			
Notalgia,	1		1			2	3
Odontalgia,	5						
Ophthalmia,	8	3				1	4
—— purulent,	1		1			4	1
—— scrofulous,	1			1			
—— chronic,	1	1					
—— tarsi,	1						
—— Egyptian,	1						1
—— syphilitic,	1	1					1
Otorrhœa,	1						
Otitis,	1			1			
Ozæna,	1						1
Palpitatio cordis,	2	1					1
Paralysis,	4						1
—— incipient,	1			1	1	1	1
Parotidea,	2						1
Pertussis,	2						2
Pharyngitis,	1	1				1	1
Phlegmon,	1						
Phthisis, (1 died)	12	4	1		1	1	
—— incipient,	21	2		4			1
—— pulmonalis,	7	3				3	1
—— dyspeptica,	1					3	12
Pleurodynia,	1					4	
Pneumonia,	7	1					1
Polypus nasi,	1			1			1
Psoric abscess,	1						5
Psoriasis,	3	2				1	
Pulsation of whole body,	1						1
Ramollissement,	1				1	1	
Rheumatismus,	6	3				1	
—— acute,	12						
—— chronic,	12	4				1	2
—— mercurial,	2			2		4	8
Rheumatism of chest,	2			1		3	3
—— periostous,	1						1
Salt Rheum,	1					1	
Scabies,	3	1		1		1	
Schirrus mammae,	1						
Sciatica,	1			1			
Scrofula,	10	2			1	2	
Scrofulous ulceration,	2	2		2		3	3
Spasmus ventriculi,	1						
Sprue,	1						1
Sternalgia,	2						1
Stomatitis,	2						2
Syphilis, secondary,	2						2
Tinea capitis,	3			1			1
Tonsillitis,	4			2		1	1
Tumor,	1						3
Tussis verminosa,	1						1

Names of Diseases.	Number of patients.	Left improved.	Left without amend.	Under Treatment.	Discharged incurable.	Result unknown.	Cured.
Tussis convulsiva periodica,	1						1
Ulcer,	1						1
Ulcer crura,	3	1		1		1	1
Ulceration of cornea,	1	1					
Urinary calculus,	1	by operation,					1
Urticaria,	1					1	
Uterine tumor,	1					1	
Vaccina,	1						1
Vaginal ulceration,	1			1			
Vertigo,	1						1
Vesiculæ,	2					2	
Vulnus,	1						1
Total,	407	66	7	45	5	91	192

It is proper to state, in connection with this report, that the fourteen Physicians in attendance at the Dispensary are divided into classes; and one day in a week is allotted to each class. Each Physician has his own patients who attend only on his day, except in instances of acute diseases. The patients who have been treated, and included in the statistical table, were mostly suffering from chronic diseases of long standing; and all of them had been inmates of hospitals, or had been treated at other dispensaries, or in private practice.

When patients have been relieved, or cured, they frequently fail to report the result of the treatment. The Patrons of the Institution are therefore earnestly requested to urge upon those they recommend for treatment, the importance of attending to this duty.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D.  
EDWARD BAYARD, M. D.  
S. B. BARLOW, M. D.  
B. F. JOSLIN, M. D.  
R. A. SNOW, M. D.  
B. F. BOWERS, M. D.  
Jno. A. McVICKAR, M. D.

JOHN TAYLOR, M. D.  
CLARK WRIGHT, M. D.  
R. W. BOLLES, M. D.  
JAS. H. ALLEN, M. D.  
JOHN HAWKS, M. D.  
H. HULL CATOR, M. D.

*Results of homœopathic treatment of the Asiatic Cholera in 1830 and 1831, published by Andrew Mordvinow, President of the Imperial State Council, at St. Petersburg.*

	Sick.	Cured.	Died.
In several villages and hamlets in the government of Saratow,	625	564	61
On the estate of Mr. Lvoff,	50	50	—
Do. do Stalipin,	13	12	1
Do. do Povalichin,	38	36	2
Do. do Bituitsky,	19	16	3
Do. Baron Bode,	188	177	11
In the city of Saratow,	39	36	3
In the gymnasium of the same city,	20	20	
In a Don Cosack village,	59	53	6
In two settlements on the Caucasus line,	85	67	15
Two estates of Messrs. Tulinew and Poltoratzky, in the government of Tambow,	92	87	5
Estate of Poltoratzky in the government of Twer,	45	44	1
Total,	1273	1162	108

Ratio of deaths not quite nine in a hundred.

## CAUSES &amp; HOMŒOPATHIC TREATMENT OF THE CHOLERA.

*Including Repertories for this disease, and for Vomiting, Diarrhœa, Cholera Infantum and Dysentery.* By B. F. Joslin, M. D. Published by Wm. Radde, New York, 1849. 18mo, pp. 144. Price 50 cents.

A few years ago we were careful to read everything that appeared on the subject of the Cholera; but so many works on that disease were published, and in such quick succession, we became satiated, and ceased to notice them, as we found little or nothing new, especially in regard to the treatment of that destroyer of human life. The work before us is the most interesting we ever read, for it furnishes rules for the treatment of the Cholera so plain, that it cannot fail to be invaluable to the practitioner; not only so, but it contains information of the course necessary to be pursued in the selection of remedies in homœopathic practice in all diseases.

The work is divided into: Nature and Pathology of the Cholera. Ætiology, especially of the *Predisposing or occasional causes*. Doctrine of Infection. Hygiene and Prophylaxis. History of treatment. Early treatment. Symptoms and Treatment of the varieties of the Cholera. Symptoms and treatment of the stages of the Cholera. Cholera repertory, for symptoms and groups, with the values of the medicines distinguished. Gastric and Intestinal Repertory; *Auxiliary to the Cholera, Repertory, and adapted to Vomiting, Diarrhœa, Cholera Infantum and Dysentery.*

Dr. Joslin is an exact writer, every word he employs seems to have been most carefully considered, so that his meaning may not be doubtful. His concluding remarks on the pathology of the Cholera, are in our opinion correct, and their truthful force should be felt by the profession, especially at this time, when pathological investigations have become a sort of monomania. Dr. J. says:

"Although, neither the physiology of respiration, the chemistry of normal blood, nor the chemical pathology of Cholera, is so complete, as to justify any positive opinion as to the precise time, nor any complete theory of the manner, in which these changes commence. Indeed, the pathogeny of most diseases is obscure: and pathology seldom detects the first links in the chain of morbid phenomena. In Cholera, it can hardly be considered more fortunate with respect to some

of the subsequent ones. There is no complete theory; and I do not offer the above as such.

Fortunately for mankind, Hahnemann has discovered a law of cure which is not based upon pathological speculations. The want of such a law and of any reliable guide, is the real cause of the want of unanimity and—I may say—the uncertainty, confusion and anarchy, that prevails in the allopathic school. These have, in the case of no disease, been more conspicuous than in relation to Cholera, and never more so than at the present time."

The chapter on the "doctrine of infection" is the best we have seen. We make a short extract, viz:

"The terms contagion and infection—now extensively used in a technical sense—serve only to conceal the want of precise ideas, and the defects of a false mode of reasoning. Whence the disputes and hesitation of learned academies—and of the medical world generally—in relation to this subject? In my opinion, this confusion, disagreement, and indecision, arise from not viewing the subject in a mathematical point of view, that is, in its relation to the science of *quantity*. The popular mind is prone to inquire about the *existence* of certain things or entities, rather than their quantitative relations. It asks, is there infection in this disease or in that? It does not think to inquire, whether there is *more or less* infecting power. It does not suspect that this is the only difference in many diseases in regard to their power of propagating themselves. The medical mind—perhaps from deficiency of mathematical training—is extensively infected with this same intellectual vice. Physicians instead of recognizing degrees in the infecting power, generally found their distinctions on modes and media of transmission. Again, instead of recognizing a great diversity—as they would if they had hit on the true principle of distinction—they assume that all except a few diseases are incommunicable under any circumstances; and through those that they acknowledge capable of propagation, they arbitrarily draw a single line, and denominate the whole group on one side of that line contagious, and the whole group on the other side infectious. They have not yet perceived that what they call infection—considered as a property of the disease—is merely the contagious property in less intensity."

Dr. J. then proceeds to notice briefly, but comprehensively and clearly, the indefiniteness of the problem; the influence of dilution; the influence of dose; the routes and modes in which the Cholera travels, and the influence of susceptibility. But that which is the most valuable in the volume under notice, is the treatment of the Cholera and the Reper-

tory. The latter of itself, is worth ten times, the price of the book: and for the Repertory, if for nothing else, every physician should secure a copy. Dr. Joslin evidently has unusual skill in the Repertory department, and we hope he will be induced to furnish the profession with a complete work of this kind, which is so much needed by every practitioner. The very best work on the practice of medicine would be a full Repertory, on the plan of the one here noticed.

#### REPORTING CASES.

"Make your Journal more practical," says a correspondent; "give us cases treated homœopathically, that the same diseases treated allopathically may be compared with them, so that unbelievers may be convinced of the superiority of homœopathic practice." This looks plausible, and yet we doubt if any one would embrace homœopathy if we were to fill our Journal with cases. Has any one been led to a change of faith in medicine from the numerous cases reported by Henderson, although we wish it understood that we never regarded him as much of a homœopath. The ignorance of the leading men of the profession in Europe of homœopathy, was never more apparent than when they denounced Prof. Henderson for being fully inducted into our school. He had a glimpse of the truth, but his pathological doctrines would never allow him to prescribe in accordance with the law of cure, except by accident, as allopaths sometimes do, as for example, when they treat some cases of Influenza with small doses of *Tart. Emetic*. The numerous cases reported by Dr. Currie, exhibiting probably the best examples of the practice, have never attracted much attention. Such publications are almost always rejected, for want of confidence in him who reports them, or if this does not exist, then a severe, and often an unfair criticism, will effectually repel their force.

We ourselves reported a case of clearly marked *Traumatic Tetanus*, which we treated successfully. We took pains to examine Sir Astley Cooper on that disease, and the description he gives of it, corresponded so completely with our case, that we thought we risked nothing in naming it as above. But it was denied by more than one eminent surgeon, and the family who at first regarded it a most remarkable cure, through such influ-

ence, look upon it now as having been only an ordinary case of rheumatism. One physician told us that he was certain it "was not *Tetanus*, because it got well."

Therefore, comparing the details of cases by the two modes of treatment, we do not believe would amount to much, in spreading a knowledge of homœopathy.

Another of our correspondents, wants such reports of cases for models, to treat similar cases—this is all wrong. A well instructed physician requires nothing of the sort. He carefully notes the phenomena of the case he is about to treat; then with a clear view of the law of cure, he consults the pathogenesis of drugs, until he finds one that corresponds to the case; which is the remedy, and then he knows a favorable result will be obtained.

That physician who will most carefully note all the symptoms of a case of sickness, and not permit his mind to be influenced by any of the false speculations in pathology and diagnosis, but confine his attention to the actual phenomena of the case before him, and will then select a medicine which shall correspond in similarity, in its positively known effects in the human system; and will administer such medicine carefully prepared, in the smallest dose, and will patiently wait, and critically mark the minutest change in the symptoms of the disease, he will, in nineteen cases out of twenty, as a general thing, not be disappointed in the result. Within a few days, we had a patient to whom we administered for several days without success. In fact, he grew worse. Being thus thwarted in what we at first thought a very plain case, we applied our mind more closely to it, and at length discovered a drug, which was almost a *similimum*; and a single dose, not only afforded relief in an hour, but actually effected a cure in forty-eight hours.

Practical matter in the homœopathic school consists mainly in defining and illustrating principles. We claim that we have done much of this in the columns of this Journal, and we intend to do more. No one can move a step in the practice of our art, unless its principles are clearly perceived and comprehended. These must be ever present to the mind, so that any suggestion from whatever quarter, may instantly be determined true or false by testing them, by those positively known laws which a good God has mercifully revealed to man, to enable him to employ such means as will afford prompt relief to his



sufferings. "Like cures Like," is a law not capable or susceptible of change; and being such, no cure can possibly take place by virtue of any other principle. Here then, is a real foundation, and on it we can stand. He who attempts to apply this law on *pathological*, instead of *symptomatical* indications will utterly fail. How can *pathology* furnish principles of cure? Here is the leading blunder of the allopathic school. It has worked away at dead bodies for hundreds of years to form a true pathology, all the time seeking through it, to obtain principles of cure; but it has completely failed to accomplish this object, and human maladies are no better treated now in that school, than they were two thousand years ago; and no improvement can take place, so long as *pathology* is made the basis of cure. Therefore, we are liable to fall into the error, as many have done, by acknowledging the law of cure, but using allopathic tools to work it. We cannot pursue this subject further at this time, but we shall have occasion to recur to it again.

*Tobacco vs. Cholera.*—Dr. John W. Moore states in a Mobile paper that he cured one hundred or more extreme cases of the Cholera, *not losing one*, by the use of *Tobacco*. He gave it in the form of an enema, and also in some instances internally by the stomach. "He has no doubt but that Cholera may be as easily managed as the fever of our country." What next?—*Annalist*.

The above is the only sensible mode of treatment of the Cholera, we have met with in the allopathic school, and yet it does not appreciate the value of the remedy employed by Dr. Moore in that disease. Perhaps Dr. M. is not one of the oligarchy. *Tobacco* will cure the Cholera in small attenuated doses, after the copious evacuations had been relieved by *Veratrum*; constant paroxysms of nausea, being at times more violent, with cold sweat, occasional vomiting, oppression of the stomach, some anguish and restlessness, cramp and tearing in the limbs. If the Cholera should prevail among us, we hope *Tobacco* as a remedy will not be overlooked. We urge it upon the attention of allopaths, as it comes recommended by one of their own number. Is there anything absurd about the remedial efficacy of *Tobacco* in Cholera, Mr. *Annalist*, that induced you to ask "what next?" Did you suspect the presence of *similia similibus*? Your suspicions were well founded.

## CHOLERA.

The following have just reached us from London, viz:

"The acting Committee of the Edinburgh Homœopathic Dispensary of the results of the homœopathic treatment of the Asiatic Cholera in Edinburgh, from the 8th to the 27th October, 1848. Immediately on the appearance of the disease in that city, Drs. Russell, Wielobycki, Lyschinski, and Sutherland, assisted by Drs. Atkin and Dr. Cockburn, resolved to relieve each other in attendance at the homœopathic dispensary at all hours day and night, during its prevalence, with the view to render aid in every case in which they might be applied to, and the reports thus far show 61 cases treated, with only 17 deaths, or about twenty-eight per cent; while the allopathic reports of the Police authorities show 77 deaths out of 121 cases, or sixty-four per cent."

### *West London Homœopathic Dispensary.*

Since the address was printed, a report of the Committee of the Edinburgh Homœopathic Dispensary has been received, containing the following statement respecting the number of cases of Cholera that have come under their care, from the 8th to the 27th of October, 1848.

Total number, 77. Recovered, 40. Died, 17. Sent to Infirmary, 13—(These patients were sent to the Infirmary in consequence of being without food, clothing, and fuel; domestic treatment, without the necessaries of life, being of course hopeless).—Otherwise removed, 3. Under Treatment, 4.

The great success of homœopathy will be evident on comparing this statement with the official account of cases of Cholera in Edinburgh, ascertained by the Surgeon of Police, from the 4th to the 29th of the same month.

Cases, 136. Deaths, 86. Recoveries, 15. Remaining, 35.

Mortality under homœopathic treatment, about 30 per cent.

Mortality under allopathic treatment, about 86 per cent.

We can't attend as we desire, to the *Annalist* in this number. He mistakes us in an essential point. We are not a partisan in the worst sense of that word, as the *Annalist's* article taken as a whole represents us. A

strict partisan would conceal the weak points, and the rotten parts of his party: we have never done so, nor ever will. The difficulty under which the *Annalist* labors, in regard to us, is owing either to a want of information of the doctrines and practice of our school, or he is himself a partisan in its worst sense. We would inform our neighbor, of what perhaps he is not aware of, that many in Europe and in this country, who were sent forth from allopathic colleges most miserably educated, and who were never particularly favored by nature or grace for the work of treating the sick, have sought admission into the homœopathic school, and although not acknowledged by those who know them, yet they call themselves homœopaths, and their mode of practice is very useful for journalists of allopathy, to enable them to pen articles against what they, in charity we are bound to think, deem homœopathy, but which has little or nothing to do with it.

#### AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF HOMŒOPATHY.

The American Institute of Homœopathy, will hold its usual annual meeting in Philadelphia, on the second Wednesday in June next. It is hoped that the assemblage on that occasion will be large. We understand that an unusually large number of physicians will attend from this city and state. It has also been intimated to us, that Ohio will be represented by a large number. We would urge the attention of every practitioner of homœopathy to the Institute, and hope he will not fail to avail himself of the privilege of becoming a member. The translation of Hahnemann's *Materia Medica*, was proposed last year, and a committee appointed for that purpose, but owing to the difficulty of obtaining a publisher of the work, we doubt if any progress has been made by the committee. Now, if every homœopathic practitioner would join the Institute, there would be funds enough to not only issue the above named *Materia Medica*, but other publications of value. Our colleagues in England are now engaged in securing funds to enable their association to bring out works on medicine. With all due respect to our brethren of the homœopathic school, we do not think our zeal, as a general thing, is sufficiently intense in the great work of medical reform;

there should be more sacrifice of time and money, in the great cause of homœopathy. The Institute can be made the instrument of accomplishing much good, if all would join it. It has done much already, but we wish to see homœopathic practitioners, throughout our country, enrolled members of it, and each one with singleness of purpose, labor according to his ability, for the general good of medical science and art.

Dr. Joslin will deliver the annual Address. This alone should command a large attendance. We regret that we have not received from the Committee on "Examination of Candidates" a notice of their arrangements for the above meeting, perhaps it was not necessary. We will answer for it, that the committee will be in session, on the afternoon and evening previously to the day of the meeting of the Institute.

#### "LEGITIMATE MEDICINE."

"Legitimate medicine" is a term invented in Europe a few years ago by allopaths, and monopolized by the allopathic school in this country, as expressive of itself. It seems to be employed on the same principle as quack medicine merchants label their nostrums: as "Pulmonary Liniment," "Pulmonary Embrocation," "Pain Extractor," "Hunters Red Drop," "Venus Pills," &c., &c.

"*Legitimate medicine*" is therefore a label for allopathic physicians; pasted on them by Medical Journals, and the American Medical Association, to let the people know where genuine medicine, or real medicine may be obtained.

The New York Academy of Medicine is a fair specimen of "legitimate medicine." It not only has had the label pasted on it as a body by Medical Journals, but it has gone further, and placed its members in the New York Directory, and in the Daily Newspapers with the label upon their backs. As all associations, and all persons have the right to select their own names, and as allopaths appear to have pretty generally agreed to change theirs, we have no objections that these should be known and distinguished hereafter, throughout all creation as "*legitimate medicine*." What is in a name?—A good deal. Shrewd fellows those *legitimists*.

## ACTION OF NATURE IN DISEASE.

"The medical world may now be considered divided into two great parties, the first consisting of those who look upon the symptoms of disease, in almost all cases, as something to be "beaten down" by "energetic" measures; and the second, comprising those who look upon symptoms as furnishing indications of efforts of nature, which should, for the most part, be suffered to proceed to their ordinary terminations. It will be supposed that between bodies entertaining such opposite views, an active warfare must be looked for; but although this supposition is, in some measure, borne out, since warfare of the most determined kind is now waging in the profession, it takes a direction different from what might have been looked for, and which, to non-medical persons, will appear wholly unaccountable.

Instead of each of the two parties just described collecting their respective adherents, and fighting on the broad principle between them, the second party (those who recognize symptoms as the efforts of nature) is broken up into two portions, and one of these portions is actually more bitter in its hostility to the remaining part of its own body, than is the party which may be regarded as its natural enemy, and which contends that symptoms should be beaten down; so strong, in fact, is this feeling, that a sort of offensive alliance is recognized between the two differing bodies, in which it is contracted, that while each puts forward its respective and opposite opinions, the great effort shall be to make these heterogeneous views both perform the same work, namely, that of crushing the section which, entertaining to the fullest extent the principle contended for by the second party, has the misfortune under the ban of these, its proper friends, on account of some unexplained prejudice.

The section against which the combined movement is carried on, consists of the homœopathic practitioners. The theory of this practice is, that all the actions which we term "symptoms," and which are manifested during disease, are merely so many salutary processes set up by nature, to remove some morbid cause which is present in the system, and that, consequently, the great effort of the practitioner should be to aid these processes, by administering such medicines as are found to stimulate to the performance of them. Now in contending for this view, the homœopaths, as has been already mentioned, are entitled to look for comfort from a large body of practitioners by whom in its general sense it has, of late, been strictly maintained; yet by some strange and inexplicable perversion, these parties not only openly profess to be their decided opponents, but while in every shape promulgating the homœopathic theory, actually revel in the idea that they are giving the homœopaths "hard hits." They do not go quite to the extent of the homœopathic doctrine, because that doctrine recognizes it to be a principle or a law, that medicines, to yield favorable results, must be given to act

in harmony with the symptoms; but they contend that, in a large majority of cases, the efforts of nature are salutary, and that no reform in medicine will be effected until this is so generally admitted, that practitioners, instead of resorting to a violent and perturbing medication, shall rather seek to wait upon Nature—to pause where they do not see how they can assist her, and to offer aid upon all possible occasions. Their only clear difference with the homœopaths consists in the circumstance, that while the homœopaths contend that Nature is never on any pretext to be opposed, these gentlemen assert that she must occasionally be subjected to a check, since, although on the whole she means well, and for the most part knows what she is about and can unite fractured bones, heal up wounded parts, call into action new organs when others are injured or destroyed, and, in short perform so much, that for centuries the theory of a sentient principle superintending the functions of the body has always, more or less, been entertained, she sometimes runs into excesses, which, if she possessed their knowledge, she would not be likely to commit. Now, this difference is not a wide one, and as it is simply grounded on what appears, at all events, to be nothing worse than timidity or modesty on the part of the homœopaths, it is hard to see why these practitioners should be so bitterly opposed, or whence the delusion could have arisen, that to multiply proofs of the curative powers of nature will be the sure way of accelerating their fall.

*Progress of Hom.*

## PRETENSIONS OF ALLOPATHIC PRACTICE.

"Let us inquire then, in the first place, what are the just pretensions of the prevalent or allopathic practice to certainty and safety; what title it has, on the whole, taking together all the cases in which it is followed, and all the physicians who follow it, to be regarded as a method in which we should confide, and with which we ought to be content, of prolonging life, counteracting disease, and alleviating or preventing pain. We cannot do better, in this inquiry, than to take the declarations of men who have devoted the labor of their lives to this practice, and who, if any could, should be able to pronounce his eulogy, Boerhave, an illustrious name in medicine, uses the following remarkable language:

"If we compare the good which half a dozen true disciples of *Æsculapius* have done since their art began, with the evil which the immense number of doctors have inflicted upon mankind, we must be satisfied that it would have been infinitely better for mankind if medical men had never existed."

But Boerhave, it may be said, lived a hundred years ago, and was himself a reformer in medicine; since his time the methods of the art have become more rational and more safe. Hear then, Dr. Pereira, himself a ve-



hement adversary of the homœopathic practice. In his *Lectures on Pharmacology*, published in 1835, in the *London Medical Gazette*, he says, speaking of the common practice:

'We can hardly refuse our assent to the observation of the late Sir Gilbert Blane, that in many cases patients get well in spite of the means employed; and sometimes, when the practitioner fancies that he has made a great cure, we may fairly assume the patient to have had a happy escape.'

Here is a confession of great uncertainty and great danger in the ordinary practice of medicine at the present day. If so many patients recover in spite of improper treatment, how many must perish by improper treatment; if what is supposed to be a cure by medicine, is sometimes only an escape from its effects, it is equally probable that the deaths which are supposed to be caused by disease, are sometimes caused by the prescriptions of the practitioner. But let us look a little more closely into the nature of this uncertainty and danger, and in doing this, I propose to take as our guide an able writer of the present school of medicine.

Dr. Abercrombie of Edinburgh, an eminent physician, in his book entitled "*Inquiries concerning the Intellectual Powers and the Investigation of Truth*," remarks that the uncertainty, and of course the danger, of medical practice is principally felt in two respects; first, in regard to the characters of disease, and secondly, in regard to the remedies employed. Of the first he says:

'Since medicine was first cultivated as a science, a leading object of attention has been to ascertain the characters or symptoms by which internal diseases are indicated, and by which they are distinguished from other diseases that resemble them. But with the accumulated experience of ages bearing upon this important subject, our extended observation has only served to convince us how deficient we are in this department, and how often, even in the first step in our progress, we are left to conjecture. A writer of high eminence has even hazarded the assertion, that those persons are most confident in regard to the characters of disease whose knowledge is most limited, and that more extended observation generally leads to doubt.'

As to the effect of medicines upon the patient, Dr. Abercrombie remarks:—

'An equal or even more remarkable uncertainty attends all our researches on the second head to which I have referred, namely, the action of external agents upon the body. These engage our attention in two respects, as causes of disease, and as remedies; and in both these views the action of them is fraught with the highest degree of uncertainty.'

Observe the terms chosen by this sensible and cautious Scotchman—"the highest degree of uncertainty." Let me here remark, that

where so much uncertainty exists in regard to the effects of medicines, there must be frequent mischief done by the practitioner. Prescribing, as he must do, according to his best conjectures, he must sometimes prescribe hurtfully, and in such a manner as to occasion the death of his patient. He who shoots in the dark is not only likely to miss his aim, but is in danger of maiming or killing those whom he would gladly spare.

Again, after showing what exactness has been attained in other branches of science; with what confidence, for example, in chemistry, certain results are expected from certain preparations, and how this confidence is never disappointed, Dr. Abercrombie proceeds to say—

'With what different feelings [we contemplate a case of dangerous internal disease,—its probable progress and termination, and the effects which our remedies are likely to produce in arresting it—those best can tell who have most experienced them.'

I shall make but one more quotation from this writer, and it is remarkable for the force of its language. He is speaking of the difficulty of making use of previous medical experience.

'When in the practice of medicine,' says this acute writer, 'we apply to new cases the knowledge acquired from other cases which we believe to be of the same nature, the difficulties are so great, that it is doubtful whether in any case we can properly be said to act upon experience, as we do in other branches of science. The difficulties and sources of uncertainty which meet us at every stage of such investigation, are in fact so great and numerous, that those who have the most extensive opportunities of observation will be the first to acknowledge that our pretended experience must in general sink into analogy, and even our analogy too often into conjecture.'

How much truth there is in these remarks, all who have observed with moderate attention the course and results of medical practice can testify. We all know with what confidence the young practitioner begins his career, sure of curing diseases by the methods laid down in his books; we see him meeting with disappointment after disappointment, and after many failures we find that he has unlearned that confidence, and in its stead has been taught the melancholy lesson of doubt, the wisdom of cautious and wary conjecture, the surest wisdom of the prevalent school of medicine and the parent of its safest practice. We see how often those very prescriptions which are meant for remedies and which are applied with the best lights of the practitioner, are followed by an immediate increase of the malignity of the disease, and probably accelerate death."—*Bryant on Homœopathy*.